

**Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, March 16, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.**

(15 minutes 5:30-5:45 for agenda items 1-5)

1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call.

Chairman Gillon called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners: Chairman Alex Gillon, Vice Chairman John Griffin, and Commissioners James Eaton, Michael Hadley, Marty Losoff, Alain Soutenet, and Norm Taylor

Staff: Kathy Levin, John O'Brien, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey

2. Commission/Staff announcements and summary of current events by Chairman/staff.

John O'Brien indicated that a vacation rental enforcement issue went to trial on March 4th and the defendant was found guilty; sentencing will be next Monday.

3. Approval of minutes for the following meetings:

Tuesday, February 16, 2010 (R)

Tuesday, March 2, 2010 (R)

The Chairman indicated that there were minutes to approve for February 16th and March 2nd.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Griffin moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Eaton seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

4. Public Forum – for items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).

The Chairman opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. Discussion regarding the Update of the Sedona Community Plan and reports from Working Teams.

Mike Raber indicated that the schedule for the working teams is now set through June, and if any Commissioners didn't get a copy, it can be sent to them. Commissioners also should have received an overview of the Circulation Element and a list of community issues that were important in the last Community Plan update. The Council is considering the initiation of the Community Plan update process on March 23rd.

Mike emphasized the need to avoid getting ahead of the public participation process; we are at the beginning of the background phase of this Community Plan update and we are still setting up the

process for community outreach, the ways we might restructure the document, and the scope of things like sustainability and redevelopment. We shouldn't get into specific recommendations until we hear from the public. It also has been suggested that we provide opportunities for public input in our Planning & Zoning Commission meeting agendas, not just in the public forum, but also as an integrated component of the regular plan update agenda item, and we may want to ensure those are on the second meeting of the month, rather than all Commission meetings.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if there will be the public forum and an agenda item for public comments and Mike explained that like on this agenda item #5, we could add, "and comments from the public", so the public would know they could make comments. The Vice Chairman indicated that we have done that in the past, but the sequence of when to do it is a little trickier than the normal process during a development meeting. Mike pointed out that if we receive some differing opinion on how to integrate that from our Legal Counsel, we would take that into consideration.

The Chairman added that we still need the Public Forum for issues not on the agenda and suggested that we might also want to put something upfront in the agenda to say that there also will be a portion of the meeting available for people to make comments on the Community Plan update, so it doesn't get buried in the agenda.

Commissioner Losoff noted that when notices are put in the newspapers, we could also list the meetings with an opportunity for public participation. Commissioner Soutenet asked how the public would be informed of those meetings besides the public notice and Mike explained that at this point, they would see it on the City's website and at the physical posting places. Chairman Gillon asked if, after the kick-off with the City Council, we could arrange with the newspapers to have a brief interview to say we are kicking off the process and include that. Mike indicated that staff had discussed having that with all of the media, and in any other announcement opportunities we have in the future, we could note that in the second P&Z meeting of the month, there would be an opportunity for input on the Community Plan.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that it seemed that at least part of the media would be interested in reporting on it on a regular basis and Mike noted there was pretty good success with that during the last update. Staff got with the media ahead of a lot of the series of big public input meetings and had good coverage, and that definitely is something that will be coming up. Chairman Gillon noted that he didn't hear any objections to that idea and asked if, when Mike talks to the City Council at the next meeting, he also plans to talk about the working teams and Mike stated yes.

Mike Raber indicated that the Community Plan Format Team met on March 1, and included in the packet is the list of general goals for that team; the current Community Plan format, or how the plan document is currently assembled; plus the breakdown of the plan elements into the ones that are required, optional and not mentioned in the state statute. Mike referenced page 3 of the memo in the packet and indicated that it mentions areas where we are looking for feedback. It is really talking about the plan format and reducing or combining some elements, and it talks about some potential constraints in doing that. The recommendation would be that elements called out in the state statute would not be combined with other elements, but there may be some latitude in addressing the ones that aren't described in the state statutes.

Mike explained that a couple of ideas on organizing the plan were discussed; one was focusing the plan around the goals, objectives, actions and other items required by state statute, and then putting all of the discussion about issues and background in a separate document or an appendix. The other idea was that each element would contain a much more succinct summary of the issues, and it

would all be combined in the first three chapters of the plan as an executive summary. All of those intro statements could be put together with the goals and objectives of the community profile, etc., in the first three chapters of the plan to create an executive summary, and then that document would become very valuable in terms of communicating with the public, because it would be much easier for the public to understand the real recommendations in the plan. Mike also indicated that the team discussed an implementation program having measurable actions, and one of the charges of that team would be to work on what those measures would be.

Mike reported that the Redevelopment Team has met twice so far, and page 4 of the memo in the packet lists some of the draft goals. The focus is really on how we can ensure consistency between the Community Plan and any future direction on how we look at specific planning for things like the SR89A corridor, etc. The team is also exploring opportunities for getting specific community input on the community's visions and values on the SR89A corridor and other commercial corridors, to come up with an approach for doing that, which is something we may want to bring forward to the Commission as we get more into that. One of the things to highlight is taking a more incremental approach in getting input from the community prior to getting further down-the-road in a workshop. We would make that part of the community input process in initial meetings by asking what kinds of places they like to visit. That approach was done in Casa Grande, and they asked the community, "What are your favorite places and what are your favorite communities?", and then we could take some time to get some input and research on what made those communities the way they are and apply that feedback later in the process with, for instance, some visual highlights of what other communities have done that express those values on highway corridors. Then, we may get a little better feedback from the community on what they think is important.

Mike explained that one thing the Redevelopment Team is being cautious about is that we can't get into a specific planning process as part of the Community Plan update, so we have to find something that we can put into the plan that makes that process, should we decide to start it, a little easier down-the-road.

Mike indicated that an overview of the Circulation Element was included as Attachment 2 in the packet and it focuses on the West Sedona Corridor, plus there are some other areas that need to be updated in that element. Over the next month, more updated data will be provided from that element. Additionally, some of the accomplishments were also included from that element in the packet. On page, 5 we listed the previous community issues from the last update.

Kathy Levin indicated that Commissioner Losoff and Commissioner Eaton are on the Public Participation Team and they reviewed the draft outline and made some recommendations on getting to the media quickly after the Council initiates the process on the 23rd. We discussed the various media and their contacts. They also made some comments about the role of public participation, the facilitators and what we should be listening for. They felt it was important for staff to dispel rumors and to be there to listen in these community meetings and community organizational presentations, and that a facilitator would help be a bridge between the public and the staff.

Kathy indicated the team also identified what they thought would be some hot topics in the community, including that the City Council approves everything, the NSA, the lights on SR89A, possibly an alternate route, housing and density, transit, general despair about government in general, the City not listening to anybody, and Council being in the pockets of developers. Kathy explained that they also indicated that it would be important to have staff resources at some of the community meetings, including a representative from Public Works and Finance, to answer some of the more technical questions in those areas. The use of comment cards, questionnaires and a

PowerPoint presentation were also discussed. Kathy explained that she made a draft presentation to be used when presenting to community organizations for the working team to critique and so far it has been arranged to meet with 10 different groups between March and May. The members of the working team took the CD home, and she started revising it based on their comments, and Commissioner Eaton prepared a new draft that the team will review Thursday. In the meantime, staff has been working on the first newsletter, comment cards, etc., for the team to also review.

Chairman Gillon asked if the community meetings would be general or sort of themed like this meeting would address infrastructure and another meeting would talk about transportation, etc. Kathy explained that the first set of meetings are to community service organizations and the format is to describe the purpose of the Community Plan, the timeline, and ask if they have any critical key issues that they could identify at that meeting or any priorities that they would like to see the Community Plan address. The other set of meetings are what we call community-wide meetings and they will be set up in May. In those meetings, we would have more staff expertise in the room, plus more exhibits are being developed for those, but they would really be listening sessions.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that we have only had one meeting, so we haven't gotten into those details; there will be a series of community meetings between now and June, and probably the first series will be more generic, and then as we get more feedback, from September going forward, they will probably be a lot more specific to an element or an issue. Kathy added that they are tentatively scheduled for the week of May 11th, with three meetings, two in the evening and one in the daytime, pending Council's review on March 23rd.

Kathy reported that the Sustainability Team had its first meeting today and Commissioner Soutenet and Commissioner Hadley are on that working team. As a backdrop, we used the ideas of the working team assignments that were presented last February and talked about a potential definition for sustainability. Commissioner Soutenet had several that he could draw from using his laptop and he will return to the next meeting with a couple of refined definitions that the working team may consider. They also discussed the areas in which sustainability could be threaded through the Community Plan and decided that the plan would be divided amongst them to look at the specific actions in there now, and while they may not use the word sustainable, they represent sustainability principles, and that will be brought to the next meeting to look at what the plan currently says. The team is also going to research other communities of similar size and demographics that also may be resort destinations with high environmental values to find out what they are doing with respect to conservation and sustainability. Lastly, the team would like to bring expertise to the full Commission and the community, using local resources and others to help us better understand how it could be applied to the community.

Chairman Gillon asked if the results of the research of other communities would be a collection of ideas that would be put before the public at one of the meetings and Kathy explained that they are just collecting information now, not making any recommendations, they just want to find out what other communities are doing and what their capacity is, what is doable and what is enforceable. They also discussed modeling, because she had been with the other working teams talking about measurable outcomes, and they wanted to focus their efforts ultimately, with the community's guidance, on measurable sustainability initiatives.

Regarding the Redevelopment Team, Commissioner Losoff pointed out that it says that it is evaluating the potential benefit of conducting a visioning session later in the year and asked if that would be in conjunction with the community meetings or a series of separate meetings. Mike explained that hasn't been figured out yet, but it is something that we need to have the

Redevelopment Team weigh in on. Another working team is working on the public participation process, so we will have to be sure that it is integrated. One thing discussed today was not doing this as a standalone one-time workshop and that we have a more incremental approach to that, so we get people thinking about their values early in the process.

Chairman Gillon indicated that the Redevelopment Team has come to the conclusion that at the very least we want to have some support in the Community Plan for a process that in the future will get us beyond just the codes we have now, but that is just a process discussion that says here is where we will have public participation, etc. Most of the discussion has been how much more than that do we want to do, do we want to take the first step towards getting some of the content of redevelopment in front of us by perhaps having some way to get at the public's values, and that is the second part we were just talking about.

Commissioner Losoff indicated those are good ideas, as long as they are coordinated with the Public Participation Team, so there is no confusion. Chairman Gillon indicated that all of the working teams should assume that they ought to coordinate public meetings through the public process, so there is consistency in how we do it.

Commissioner Soutenet asked in which way we will address that question about expert participation; we had initially discussed encouraging public participation at the expert level and how we could practically integrate that expertise into the meetings. Right now public participation is non-existent in the meetings. Even though there is space for some public comment, it is not part of the discussion; whereas, he would welcome having expert participation in the meetings and for the Commission or city staff to identify those individuals that would be most beneficial to the process. John O'Brien asked if he means for an expert to attend a sustainability working team meeting, and then be able to discuss that with the working team and Commissioner Soutenet clarified to have input that is valuable to the process.

Mike Raber indicated that the working team meetings don't necessarily have to preclude public input, it is just that they aren't really set up for that, but if one person attends a meeting and has something to say, he doesn't think you automatically shut them out. It is just not the venue typically for that and if you got 12 to 15 people, you would need a different format. John O'Brien indicated that with other working teams, people were either brought in or the team went to them, like landscape architects provided input for the Landscaping Ordinance revision and the Building Heights Team met with architects, so they were just invited, when the team wanted that expertise.

Chairman Gillon clarified that they were specifically structured meetings for that purpose. Commissioner Soutenet indicated that in that context, we could invite experts to participate in the meetings and John O'Brien agreed. Vice Chairman Griffin asked if the goal is to see whether or not some of the things are feasible, and then put that concept in the Community Plan. These are more general items versus when you talk about experts coming in when we're rewriting ordinances, so he is trying to understand what we are doing. Every team is excited and wants to get to the end goal of having some deliverables and implementing something, but we are talking about Community Plan text. John O'Brien recalled that a couple of meetings ago, the Commission indicated that if things come out of the working teams that are more ordinance or Building Code-related, we won't just discard those ideas. We may take that and run it through another application, which would be a code amendment. Mike Raber cautioned that the teams needed to remain aware of where they are in the overall Community Plan update process, so you don't get ahead of the community. Vice Chairman Griffin pointed out that the teams need input from the community as to whether or not the community wants it and that may mean in terms of cost, etc.

Kathy indicated the team discussed using a scientific approach as much as possible by collecting the data on water, land availability, air quality and the environment, to see if there were areas where improvement could take place with measurable ways to scientifically support principles of sustainability. Chairman Gillon pointed out that all of that is data collection for purposes of having something to present to the public to get their priorities.

The Chairman indicated that these working team meetings are sort of owned by staff, so if there are to be rules about participation, staff is welcome to do it, because the Director convened the working teams. John O'Brien agreed these are staff-created working teams and Chairman Gillon indicated that we may want to do things a little differently in the working teams, depending on the topic, but it may be wise to be explicit about the experts that we are inviting, with the expectation that they will participate in the meeting, to distinguish that from the general public who comes, because they may feel that they have as much right to participate. We have to be careful that we keep the working teams working. John O'Brien agreed that the experts would just provide information that would later be presented to the community. The Chairman added that in the announcements of the working team meetings, you may want to say there will be some experts brought in to discuss those issues. Mike Raber suggested that on the notice it could be specifically called out. John O'Brien added that if the public sees the agenda, the public may have more interest in that meeting too. The Chairman agreed, but indicated he wanted something to say that we are glad they are here, but this person is a participant and gets to talk. Mike Raber added, or make it clear where they do get to talk or that there is an opportunity for them to do that, and Chairman Gillon agreed and noted that we may get to the point, even in the working teams, of having part of the agenda for public input. Mike Raber noted that if the teams felt it was manageable they could do that.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that all of the working team meetings should have the opportunity for public participation, even if limited to five or ten minutes, and we should all be encouraged to invite certain people, because they are open meetings, and the more transparent we are, the better. It should be up to the chairperson or staff to ensure that it doesn't get out of hand, but the more input the better. It doesn't mean we have to do everything said, but we can filter it and do what we think is best and maybe there should be a section for public participation. Chairman Gillon agreed, but noted that we also don't want the public to feel like every time a comment is made they are welcome to jump in and give their opinion. Mike Raber indicated that staff will look into how we can possibly accommodate some of that.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that in the Growth Committee, which was a committee of about 12 or 15, there were subjects for each meeting with experts for most of them, and at every one, there was an opportunity for public input and it worked. Vice Chairman Griffin pointed out that the working teams need to have the flexibility to do blue-sky discussions. We are kicking ideas around, so we want to ensure that everything we say isn't taken as what P&Z is going to do; that is what we need to avoid, because we want to be able to have the discussions and explore different options. We are so early in the process, hopefully, we will be able to maintain that and all work together. With the public participation format, it is all tied together and staff will have to try to integrate all of the ideas, because even in the Redevelopment Team, if the format changes, it may slightly change how we put things together, but in the end, it will benefit the whole update. It is exciting to look at these things, because we never really looked at them before; we have all just done it as a process that wasn't as a reevaluation, but integrating it and getting everyone together is going to be important, to ensure the teams don't stumble over each other. It will be important for staff to bring forward things from certain teams that may affect the way other teams work, and we have to rely on staff to do that, because only staff knows what all teams are talking about.

Mike Raber pointed out that we have that opportunity in these meetings and asked if there is any feeling among other Commissioners on the format of the plan; in the last meeting, we discussed the scenario of creating a base document that takes a lot of the issues and background out and puts it somewhere else. Commissioner Taylor indicated that two schemes were outlined and one sounded like the right move to address the repetition. Making an introduction of those three sections is all you have to read to know what the Community Plan really is, and then if you want to pursue the details, you can go into the various sections. Currently, if you read the document, you are reading the same thing again as soon as you turn the page. Additionally, he would like to see us get rid of architectural jargon, like FACs. He knows how architects write and they tend to get into special names, but it doesn't work too well for people who aren't in that profession. He would rather see it talk about the area between Basha's and Safeway or where the nursery is or out Dry Creek Road, to describe them rather than calling them FACs (Focused Activity Centers).

Commissioner Hadley indicated that is a good point, because what does "Focused Activity Center" mean; he doesn't understand what some of the stuff means, but being specific to our own community solidifies and clarifies it for a lot of people. Mike Raber pointed out that they are described, but the fact that it is hard to figure out what it means, indicates that you don't gravitate right to it; it gets lost in there, so that needs to be rectified. Those things need to stand out, and then the jargon is another thing to address.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that a couple of meetings ago, we resolved that at some point, somebody will translate it into English for the working person. Mike Raber noted that came up in the last update; our focus was on meeting the Growing Smarter requirements, but we heard that comment that at some point it needed to be synthesized so it is easier to understand.

Chairman Gillon noted that there had been a discussion about having a final editing process for consistency across the entire document, where the same small group looks at the whole thing to ensure it is the same, and it may be wise to have one person in that group be somebody who is to think of it like that. The Chairman then asked if generally everyone is in favor of the idea of having something that could be pulled out of the Community Plan that is much shorter, more succinct and if read, would enable someone to have an intelligent discussion about the Community Plan, and then having appendices that has all of the support stuff.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that many of them who have been on the Commission for some years have read all of this; it is a reference document, but it is something to wade through it. Mike Raber explained that it will be more than goals, objectives and actions, because there are some, like the Land Use Element, etc., that are going to be required by statute to have policies, recommendations, etc., but a lot of the issues, discussion and background doesn't have to be in there and that is where a lot of the repetition is.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that there may be some justification for briefly explaining some of the things we have accomplished in the plan, because there is nothing worse than working on things for a number of years, and then having someone say it is too bad that you never accomplished anything. It may be good to just add a couple of paragraphs to describe a few things we have accomplished. When you look at the recommendations from the Growth Committee, a large number of those have been accomplished, and he is also big on pictures too; there is a lot of text, so maybe some small examples could be included.

Commissioner Soutenet noted that it is a basic rule that if there is no path to implementation, there is no need to put it in the plan, so that eliminates all of the unnecessary items that would not have a

practical way to implement. If the item in the plan doesn't have some indication of a path of implementation, it shouldn't be there. Chairman Gillon agreed, but indicated it is a tough standard to hold to. Mike Raber noted that the working team was going to try to come up with some scenarios with the existing plan, so we can see how this will all work together and start bringing that to the full Commission for input.

Ron Ramsey indicated that the statute says that after you have adopted the plan, the planning agency, which would primarily be the Commission, will take the following action, and here is the buzz language, "to encourage effectuation of the plan". There is a list of several items here that are usually not really paid attention to that much, in terms of the statutory overview, but we spend a lot of time looking at the components that the statute dictates. The statute really is very clear about all of the measures you have to take after the plan is adopted or when you make a change to the general plan and that is one of the reasons he wrote the memo to staff about the legal perspective, when you start. The plan is no longer a freestanding document or as in years past, just basically ignored; it is something which will control us for the next 10 years, so you have to be cautious about what you put in it, because it is not just ideas, it is implementation.

Mike Raber then reported that staff met with the Water Conservation Advisory Committee last week about providing updates to their element, and we are in the process of consolidating that information, and then we are meeting with the Parks & Recreation Commission on the 29th to describe what is going on with the Community Plan, so they can start looking at their areas as well.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that the Format Team talked about if there are opportunities to combine elements; those that are mandated by the state have to remain, but several others could be combined or consolidated; he then asked for the Commissioners' input if they had any ideas. Commissioner Taylor indicated he saw two that might be integrated; he didn't know about Historic Preservation and Arts & Culture; however, staff replied no.

Commissioner Soutenet explained that decision would be more of an outcome of the groundwork; it would become clear what elements should be combined and not combined. It would be an arbitrary decision at this stage to make that decision. Commissioner Taylor indicated that the elements were written as standalone books, but if we could get the duplication out, then it would not be so important to reduce the number of elements. Mike noted that is a very good point, because part of the problem is the redundancy and if you get rid of that, it may not be as big of a deal. Maybe the Format Team can take a shot at that first, and then we will see where we are at, and we can see if, like the Economic and Tourism Elements could be combined, but aside from that, he doesn't know.

Mike asked if there were any concerns and Commissioner Losoff indicated that he knows the City is going through its budgeting, etc., and he hopes that the Committees aren't adding more unnecessary work for staff with all of these meetings. You have to tell us if that is the case, because the whole objective of this is to make it easier by giving you more resources, so hopefully, you will keep us in line, because we could create a monster here. Chairman Gillon indicated he is checking in with Mike and Kathy to see if that is the case and Mike added that so far it is working okay, but staff will let you know.

6. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and agenda items:

Tuesday, April 6, 2010 – 5:30 p.m. – Regular

Tuesday, April 20, 2010 – 3:30 p.m. – Regular

The Chairman noted that we have a work session on the 1st at 3:30 p.m., a meeting on the 6th at 5:30 p.m. and the next update on the Community Plan on the 20th, and he will not be at the meeting on the 20th. John O'Brien indicated that the work session is on a project that is a commercial and multi-family development on Sunset scheduled for action on April 6th. Vice Chairman Griffin noted that the Commissioners were supposed to be supplied the plans and comments from the Conceptual Review, which should be with the Staff Report.

John O'Brien added that there is an introductory work session on the Farmers' Market; we have done that with a Temporary Use Permit, and now that the person running that would like to make it more of a permanent thing in the winter and the summer, so we are requiring a Temporary Use Permit; it will come to the Commission on May 4th for action. As a part of the Landscape Ordinance amendment process, the working team took the plant list through the Water Conservation Advisory Committee to have them look at the need to update that plant list, so that is going to come back to the Commission on April 6th for action on the plant list that is in the Design Review Manual. It will go through P&Z, and then to the City Council, because it is an Land Development Code amendment. Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that the only trouble is that we have disbanded the committees, so the actual committee is not able to look at that or run it by the Landscape Architect. The Recording Secretary explained that a member of the water committee, Marybeth Carlile, got a group of people together that included Dick Hubbell and several others outside of the committee to update the list.

Commissioner Losoff asked if there is a date for the retreat and John O'Brien indicated not yet, that is something he wants to discuss with the Chairman; there are a lot of other meetings and we may want to defer that. Commissioner Losoff indicated that he doesn't have a problem with that, but in a future meeting, we may want to discuss the process. We are getting things in pre-work sessions and not seeing all of the details. Chairman Gillon noted that it might be good to review the entire process and discuss if we still like how it looks. John O'Brien suggested rather than have the retreat; we may just take some of the topics and put them on regular agendas. Vice Chairman Griffin indicated the downside is that the retreat has a general agenda that allows us to really discuss a few things, so there is some advantage to having that at some future date.

7. Adjournment

Chairman Gillon called for adjournment at 4:32 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on March 16, 2010.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date